

How to Propose an Action as Objectively Necessary: The Case of Polish *Trzeba x* (“One Needs to *x*”)

Jörg Zinken and Eva Ogiermann

Department of Psychology
University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom

The present study demonstrates that language-specific grammatical resources can afford speakers language-specific ways of organizing cooperative practical action. On the basis of video recordings of Polish families in their homes, we describe action affordances of the Polish impersonal modal declarative construction *trzeba x* (“one needs to *x*”) in the accomplishment of everyday domestic activities, such as cutting bread, bringing recalcitrant children back to the dinner table, or making phone calls. *Trzeba-x* turns in first position are regularly chosen by speakers to point to a possible action as an evident necessity for the furthering of some broader ongoing activity. Such turns in first position provide an environment in which recipients can enact shared responsibility by actively involving themselves in the relevant action. Treating the necessity as not restricted to any particular subject, aligning responsive actions are oriented to *when* the relevant action will be done, not *whether* it will be done. We show that such sequences are absent from English interactions by analyzing (a) grammatically similar turn formats in English interaction (“we need to *x*,” “the *x* needs to *y*”), and (b) similar interactive environments in English interactions. We discuss the potential of this research to point to a new avenue for researchers interested in the relationship between language diversity and diversity in human action and cognition.

The impact of inherited linguistic pattern on activities is, in general, least important in the most practical contexts, and most important in such goings-on as story-telling, religion, and philosophizing—which consist largely or exclusively of talking anyway. (Hockett, 1954, p. 123)

The present study explores how cross-linguistically different grammatical structures can have consequences for the organization of everyday practical activities: cutting bread, bringing recalcitrant children back to the dinner table, making phone calls, and the like. It explores a turn format commonly used by speakers of Polish in everyday interactions in the family home to

Eva Ogiermann is now with the Department of English at the University of Surrey, United Kingdom.

We are grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their detailed and helpful comments on an earlier version of this article. We also want to thank Alan Costall, Alessandra Fasulo, Giovanni Rossi, Matylda Weidner, and Katarzyna Zinken for their feedback on earlier versions of the paper. The research reported here was supported by a grant awarded to the first author by the Economic and Social Research Council, grant reference RES-061-25-0176.

Correspondence should be sent to Jörg Zinken, Department of Psychology, University of Portsmouth, King Henry I Street, Portsmouth, PO1 2DY, United Kingdom. E-mail: joerg.zinken@port.ac.uk

enlist (Lindström, 2005) another person for the accomplishment of some such task. This turn format involves the use of an impersonal verb of deontic modality in a declarative construction: *trzeba x* (“one needs to *x*,” “it is necessary to *x*”).

Using this construction, speakers of Polish are regularly successful in enlisting another person for everyday tasks without either asking them or telling them to do something. We will give a detailed description of this practice in Polish interaction; comparatively explore the actions accomplished with grammatically similar turn formats in English family interactions; and examine participants’ orientations that become demonstrably relevant in sequences initiated by a *trzeba-x* turn (“one needs to *x*”) in contrast to requests (in English and in Polish) using an interrogative format with modal auxiliary (“can you do *x*?”). The upshot of this analysis will be to demonstrate that the grammatical details of turn design enter into the organization of *practical activities* (activities that involve movement and object manipulation) and that practical activities can be organized (for the participants to interaction) in consequentially different ways across languages where the grammatical resources for action differ.

Trzeba-x turns are one of a number of grammatical practices available to speakers of Polish to enlist another person for the accomplishment of some action. Perfective and imperfective imperatives (*Do x*; *Be doing x*), and double imperatives (roughly: *Take do x*) are the other commonly used formats in our Polish data. Prima facie, this family of grammatical formats suggests that we could say that we are studying a type of directive or a type of request in Polish. For the time being, we avoid those terms for two reasons: First, they have a long history in the study of speech acts and interaction and can therefore be suggestive of particular meanings, which might not accurately capture the practice we are about to describe. Second, these terms are used with varying meanings in the literature. Both terms have been used as very broad labels for a range of processes of enlisting another person for some activity. Both *requests* and *directives* have been defined as “utterances designed to get someone else to do something” (M. H. Goodwin, 2006, p. 515). Both have been used to cover diverse turn formats, including imperatives, interrogatives, and classic examples of (nonconventionally) indirect speech acts in declarative format (“It’s cold in here”; e.g., Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984).

Under such a broad definition we could say that the practice analyzed in this article belongs under the rubric of request or directive. However, the trouble then becomes to say what does *not* belong under this rubric (Craven & Potter, 2010). We therefore think that it will be more illuminating to adopt narrower descriptions of the practices of requesting and directing, and to discuss *trzeba-x* turns in relation to those practices. Specifically, we will treat requests as “turns at talk in which a speaker *asks* the recipient to perform a specific activity” (Curl & Drew, 2008, p. 136, emphasis added), or orients to possible contingencies that might impede the granting of the request. We will treat directives as actions “where one participant *tells* another to do something” and noncompliance is not treated as a possible response (Craven & Potter, 2010, p. 420).

Linguistically, we focus on turns in declarative format that are built with a modal auxiliary expressing necessity. Turns in declarative format can perform actions such as telling or noticing, but they are also commonly understood by recipients to be doing something else. The following telephone conversation (Extract 1), a piece of data that has been examined in the conversation analytic literature in various contexts (probably most fully in Schegloff, 1995, 2007), provides an illustration of declarative turns that do more than telling:

01 ((phone rings - once, possibly more than once))
 02 Mar: Hello?
 03 Don: 'lo Marcia,=
 04 Mar: Yea[:h]
 05 Don: = [(‘t’s) D]onny.
 06 Mar: Hi Donny.
 07 Don: Guess what. hh
 08 Mar: What.
 09->Don: .hh My ca:r is sta::lled.
 10 (0.2)
 11-> ‘n I’m up here in the Glen
 12 Mar: Oh:..
 13 {0.4 }
 14 Don: {.hhh}
 15 Don: A:nd.hh
 16 (0.2)
 17 Don: I don’ know if it’s po:ssible, but {.hhh/(0.2)} see
 18-> I haveta open up the ba:nk.hh
 19 (0.2)
 20 Don: a:t uh: (.) in Brentwood? hh=
 21 Mar: Yeah:- en I know you wan- (.) en I wou: (.) en I
 22 would, but- except I’ve gotta leave in aybout five
 23 min(h)utes. [(hheh)
 24 Don: [Okay then I gotta call somebody else. right
 25 away.
 26 (.)
 27 Don: Okay?=
 28 Mar: =Okay [#Don#]
 29 Don: [Thanks] a lot.=Bye-.
 30 Mar: Bye..

Donny produces the reason for his call in a series of turn constructional units (TCUs) in declarative format (at lines 9, 11, and 18). These TCUs are designed not just to tell Marcia about something, but rather to provide occasions for her to offer help.

A declarative TCU, then, can be a first pair-part of a sequence that is concerned with getting some more or less pressing business dealt with—in the previous case, ultimately, getting the bank opened. One way of displaying the importance of the business in question involves using a verb expressing necessity such as *have to*, *must*, or *need to* (as Donny does in line 18), what linguists call verbs of *deontic* or *dynamic modality* (e.g., Nuyts, Byloo, & Diepeveen, 2010). In English, modal verbs (like all other verbs) need to be marked for person. That is, a speaker must identify some grammatical subject of the necessity when using one of these verbs (note that this grammatical subject need not be a human agent, as in passive constructions: “the dishes need to be washed”), although this subject can be formally ambiguous in English zero-anaphora constructions (Oh, 2005). The particular choice that a speaker makes has obvious consequences for the kinds of action he can attempt to bring off and for the responsive actions that can become relevant. In the Extract 1, it is Donny who “has to” open the bank (line 18), and Marcia’s involvement in getting that necessity dealt with would have the quality of helping Donny.

The characteristic of Polish that we are going to focus on here is that it has a modal auxiliary for the expression of necessity which—in contrast to any English verb—*cannot* be marked for person: *trzeba x* (roughly: “one needs to *x*”). For example, a natural-sounding translation of the utterance *trzeba kwiaty podlać* might be “we must water the flowers.” However, there is no “we” in the Polish utterance, nor any other morphological marking of a person. Neither is the subject of this verb omitted, to be inferred from the context alone, as can be the case in some languages, for example, Japanese (Hayashi, 2003; Tanaka, 1999) or Korean (Oh, 2007). The morphosyntax of *trzeba* is such that it *cannot* be combined with a grammatical subject at all. It is possible, instead, to name a subject of the claimed necessity in the position of an indirect object. For example, it would be possible to say *trzeba nam kupić pralkę* (roughly “It is necessary for us to buy a washing machine”); however, such constructions might be largely restricted to certain genres, such as written language or official speeches. In any case, in our collection of *trzeba-x* turns we do not have a single instance of somebody naming the subject of the claimed necessity in this way. The subject of *trzeba* is an abstract collectivity, “one.”

Impersonal modal auxiliaries are common across the Slavic languages, and were already present in the oldest documented Slavic language, Old Church Slavonic (Hansen, 2000). Polish, along with several other contemporary Slavic languages, also has a modal auxiliary for the expression of necessity that *can*, and in fact *has to be*, marked for person: *musieć*. This means that it is possible in Polish to state a necessity with person marking on the verb: *muszę* (“I must”), *musimy* (“we must”), etc. The verb *musieć* is a borrowing from the German *müssen*, a form that has developed from the same Proto-Germanic root as the English *must*.

However, while person-marked declarative turns expressing necessity are rare in our Polish (and also in our English) data, the impersonal turn format *trzeba x* (“one needs to *x*”) is common.

One of the starting points for conversation analysis (CA) has been the observation that syntactic units, such as lexical items, phrases, or clauses, are a central resource in the assembly of possibly complete turns at talk (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). The role of grammatical structures in the constitution of actions has received detailed attention in a range of interactional-linguistic and conversation-analytic studies (see, for example, the papers collected in Hakulinen & Selting, 2005; Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson, 1996; Selting & Couper-Kuhlen, 2001). There is also quite a rich body of research that specifically considers the social actions afforded by particular grammatical resources across languages (see, for example, the papers collected in these volumes: Enfield & Stivers, 2007; Sidnell, 2009c). Much of this research on languages other than English has been concerned with the affordances that particular grammatical resources of a given language provide for accomplishing generic actions in the organization of interaction. To indicate the range of this body of work, we can mention studies of the implications of (relatively) free word order and limited syntactic projectability for the construction of turns in Japanese (Hayashi, 2003; Tanaka, 2000, 2005); studies of the affordances of a language’s morphosyntax for the organization of self-initiated (Fox, Hayashi, & Jasperson, 1996) and other-initiated repair (Sidnell, 2009b); or studies of the affordances of language-particular particles and lexical items for building a responsive action (several of the papers in Sidnell, 2009c; Sorjonen, 1996). Furthermore, there have been studies of the implications of language-specific resources for the accomplishment of ubiquitous but more specialized conversational activities, such as assessing (Lindström 2009; Sidnell & Enfield in press) or questioning (Egbert & Vöge 2008; see the special issue of *Journal of Pragmatics*: Enfield, Stivers, & Levinson, 2010). Some of these studies have been explicitly comparative, while others have focused on a practice in a particular language other than English without an explicit interest in comparison.

The present study builds on this line of cross-linguistic conversation-analytic work and extends it by examining the implications of language-specific grammatical resources for the organization of practical tasks. The division implied in Hockett's assessment quoted at the beginning of this article that, to put it laxly, grammar is for talking and not for getting stuff done in the world, is clinging tenaciously to research practices in the social sciences, as repeatedly criticized by Charles Goodwin (e.g., C. Goodwin, 2000). Challenges to this artificial division of language and world have come from two perspectives. On the one hand, there is work on the multimodality of talk itself, also on languages other than English (e.g., Betz & Golato, 2008; Couper-Kuhlen & Ford, 2004; Park, 2009). On the other hand, there is (less) work on the contribution of talk to the accomplishing of activities in which talking is not itself the main thing that is getting done (e.g., for some of the contributions to the special issue of *Semiotica* on multimodal interaction, see Stivers & Sidnell, 2005).

Work on languages other than English has so far focused on the first of these perspectives, studying either fundamental aspects of the organization of conversation, or activities that take place, as it were, in conversation. So far, there is a near-complete lack of conversation-analytic studies on the use of language-specific forms in the organization of practical, i.e., manual activities in languages other than English (but see Keevallik, 2010). The present study is, to our knowledge, the first to comparatively explore the implications of grammatical diversity for the accomplishment of situated, practical action of the kind that is assembled drawing on resources from a variety of semiotic fields including the positions of participants' bodies in the material environment, the availability and manipulation of relevant artifacts, body posture, and gaze, as well as turns at talk.

METHOD

The following analysis is primarily based on a corpus of video recordings made in the homes of Polish families living in Poland. The corpus consists of 24 recordings made by six Polish families, with an overall duration of approximately 10 hr. For comparative purposes, we also make use of a corpus of video recordings made in the homes of English families living in the UK. That corpus consists of 17 video recordings made by 11 English families, with an overall duration of approximately 8 hr. All families were asked to make at least two recordings while the adult couple are doing something together, such as preparing a meal, eating, or playing with their children.

The availability of video recordings is crucial for the analysis of copresent interaction, because social actions are constituted not only by words and other media available in the stream of speech, but also by other semiotic field (C. Goodwin, 2000, 2002; Streeck, 2009), such as cospeech gestures, body posture, the participants' positions in the spatial setting of the interaction, and the availability of material objects. Since the semiotic richness of situated action cannot be captured in transcripts, the extracts of the video recordings discussed in this article are available online at <http://www.ca-across-cultures.org/publications.html> (the password is "zdzblo"). All participants have given informed consent for these extracts of their recordings to be made available.

As part of a wider project on the sharing of responsibility for everyday tasks in the homes of English, Polish, and bilingual families, we explored events in which more than one person became involved in the accomplishment of some practical activity. Examples that illustrate the varying urgency and duration of such activities in our data range from removing a biscuit from

a choking baby's throat, to unloading the dishwasher, to preparing a meal. In the course of this exploration, we noticed that in Polish families, turns built with the *trzeba-x* construction are a common way of initiating sequences that enlist another person for carrying out some practical activity. We therefore decided to further investigate sequences in which *trzeba-x* turns in first position participate in bringing about the accomplishment of some practical activity.

Relevant events were transcribed using the established conventions for conversation analysis, based on the work of Jefferson (Sacks et al., 1974). We have changed the names of participants as well as of people and places referred to in the talk. The transcripts have been enhanced for the presentation of non-English materials to an English-reading audience. The second line in each transcript row provides interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses, which are based on the conventions proposed in the *Leipzig Glossing Rules* (Bickel, Comrie, & Haspelmath, 2008). Contrary to these conventions, though, we have not separated morphemes in the original language transcription (the first line) by dashes, as these conventionally indicate a "cut-off" in CA transcripts. The third line in each transcript row provides an approximately idiomatic translation into English. For the sake of brevity, the third line is omitted where it would be identical with the second line. Gaps are transcribed on one line only.

Our project is comparative in the strong sense that we are explicitly interested in the possibility that the grammar of Polish might furnish the resource for a type of social action that is not available to speakers of English. Comparative work is well established in conversation analysis, as indicated in the introduction. However, it is not without its methodological challenges, which have received some attention (Schegloff, 2009; Sidnell, 2007, 2009a). These challenges include the identification of a meaningful basis for comparison, and the need to reconcile the analysis of interactional practices from the participants' perspective with the analyst's wish to compare. We want to give some detail about how we addressed these challenges in the present study.

Previous comparative work in CA has mostly investigated how speakers accomplish generic activities in the organization of interaction, which need to be tackled by participants to interaction anywhere: constructing a turn at talk, repairing a trouble source, referring to persons. The present study enters new ground, focusing as it does on how participants enlist another for the accomplishing of an everyday practical task relating to care for the living space and its inhabitants: preparing meals, pouring juice, calling relatives, or making sure that children eat their dinner. Surely, such activities are common enough at least across the communities considered here—speakers of Polish in Poland and speakers of English in England. We therefore treated such events as an *initially viable* (although nontechnical) basis for comparison.

We became interested in the *trzeba-x* turns in Polish because they turned out to be one of the most frequent formats for initiating interactions that enlisted another person for the accomplishing of such everyday tasks. We initially analyzed in detail the situations in which speakers of Polish choose this common turn format and the kind of sequence that it initiates. This close analysis provided us with a more specific basis for comparison with English practices of enlisting another person for the accomplishment of some everyday task. This comparison then took two forms. First, we examined turn formats in English that are grammatically similar to Polish *trzeba-x* turns with the aim to establish the situations in which these are used, and the actions they initiate. Such a "form-focused" comparison can contribute to our understanding of the mutuality of a grammatical construction and the specific action that it supports. Second, we examined turn formats used by speakers of English to enlist another person for the accomplishment of some task in situations that are similar to those in which speakers of Polish might choose a *trzeba-x*

turn. Such a situation-focused comparison can contribute to our understanding of the orientations that speakers in different cultures are socialized into in the process of learning to draw on another person's cooperation.

The cases we discuss in the results section are selected either because they illustrate a generalization particularly clearly, or because they provide useful boundary cases in relation to a proposed generalization.

Trzeba-x Turns in the Organization of Practical Activities

We have found that *trzeba-x* turns are a common turn format used in Polish family interaction to enlist another person for the accomplishment of some practical activity. We want to begin by analyzing one case in some detail.

The family in Extract 2, Ilona (the mother), Jacek (the father), and their sons, 11-yr-old Bolek and 2-yr-old Staś, are eating dinner, but Staś has gone to a different room, out of the view of the camera. Bolek keeps going away from the dinner table to see what Staś is up to. At line 1, the parents have just successfully called Bolek back to the dinner table so that he would finish his food, and he complains about his brother making a mess in the boys' shared bedroom. After briefly sitting down, Bolek soon (at line 3) gets up again and runs out of the room to where his younger brother is, finally addressing him in line 6 (*Stasiu*).

This is the sequential context for the following adjacency pair, the first pair-part of which is a *trzeba-x* turn: After a silence of 1.5 s, Jacek says *Może trzeba by go wziąć* ('Maybe one would need to get him'). Ilona's response is immediate, both verbally and nonverbally: Getting up, she says *Zaraz go wezmę* ('Right now [I'll] get him,' line 9).

Extract 2 PP2-1 Maybe one would need to take him

- 01 BOLEK: [Kurcze, ja (zaszale) nasz [pokój, (.) a
Chick I (PFV-make.bed-PST-M-1SG) our room and
Oh rubbish, I (made the beds in) our room, and
- 02 JACEK: [nie skończyłeś [jedz
Not PFV-finish-PS -M-2S eat.IMP
You haven't finished Eat
- 03 BOLEK: t(h)eraz_i (1.0) hmhm (nie tam kurze ścieram)
now hmhm (no there dusts wipe-1S)
now hmhm (no I'm wiping dust there)
- 04 ((Bolek runs out of room))
- 05 BOLEK: °Jejciu on nie wiem (.) do tego wszystkiego dobierze.°
dear he not know-1S to this-GEN all-GEN.S PFV-grab.3S
Oh dear he I don't know (.) gets his hands on this all.
- 06 h Stasiu_i
Stasiu_i
- 07 (1.5) ((Ilona straightens her hand and taps table))
- 08-> JACEK: Może trzeba by go wziąć. ((looking down at plate))
Maybe trzeba COND he.ACC take.PFV.
Maybe one would need to get him.

Fifth, Ilona's responsive action treats the action of getting him as relevant *now*. This is evidenced not just (and maybe not so much) by the promptness of Ilona's getting up, but by the way she builds her responsive verbal turn. It is important here to note that Polish is a language with relatively free word order. Ilona could have built her turn in a number of different ways, expediting different elements of her response to turn-initial position, where they are closest to the turn they are responsive to (Tanaka, 2005). She could have chosen the word order *wezmę go zaraz* ("Take-1P-PFV him at.once"), with the proposed action of "getting" Staś in turn-initial position; she could have chosen the word order *jego zaraz wezmę* (him at.once take-1P-PFV), with "him" in turn-initial position, or, including the optional personal pronoun, *Ja go wezmę* ("I take-1P-PFV him"), with the subject, herself, in turn-initial position. In sum, the order in which Ilona places words to build her responsive verbal turn involves choices, and the choice Ilona makes is to place the *immediacy* of her getting him into turn-initial position, an important location in the construction of action (Schegloff, 1996).

The one characteristic that in turn-constructional terms distinguishes *zaraz* ("right now") from the other lexical items she produces is that a temporal adverbial such as *zaraz* is, in the present sequential environment, a possibly complete TCU on its own (see Extract 3). Therefore, by "expediting" the temporal adverbial *zaraz* into turn-initial position, Ilona has started to build an aligning verbal action that is recognizable as possibly complete at an earlier point in time than would have been possible had she chosen any different word order. In sum, Ilona's turn is primarily concerned not with accepting the proposed action of getting him (as opposed to other conceivable actions, such as calling Bolek back to the table), nor with accepting that *she* get him (rather than Jacek). Primarily, her turn is concerned with the temporal quality of her getting him.

How might we gloss Ilona's responsive action? Since she has not been told to do anything, calling her aligning responsive action compliance would be an unusual usage of that term. Also, her action is not well characterized as accepting. In lack of a catchier term, we will gloss her response as actively involving herself in the solution of the problem at hand.

In sum, the *trzeba-x* turn in this extract builds on a situation that requires some action, and points to a specific possible course of action. It provides a point in time at which the action of getting him becomes relevant and provides an opportunity for a coparticipant to assume responsibility and actively involve themselves in accomplishing that action. By actively involving herself in this manner, Ilona includes herself in the abstract collectivity subject to the claimed necessity and enacts the sharing of the concern to which Jacek's turn is addressed. Her responsive action is oriented not to agreement on her part, nor to any obstacles in the way of getting him, but to the urgency, the evident necessity, of the action, and thereby to its integral character for the ongoing activity of finishing a meal.

We have shown that aligning responses to *trzeba-x* turns are a way of acting as a member of a given collectivity, in our case the parental couple, and enacting shared concerns and responsibilities to take care of family needs. The following case further illustrates that aligning responses to *trzeba-x* turns are primarily oriented to the on-timeness of an action claimed to be an objective necessity.

Standing around the table, the family have just finished saying grace. The parents, Ilona (mother) and Jacek (father), have wished everyone an enjoyable meal, and Jacek and the two children are moving to sit down (during the silence in line 3). During that same silence, Ilona briefly handles two items close to her on the table: She turns a gravy jug around so that its handle will be more graspable, and she touches a napkin holder. She might, at this moment, be engaged in checking the objects on the table to establish whether all relevant preparations for eating have

been made. Whether or not that is the case, in line 4, Ilona starts producing a turn that will identify the need to pour juice.

Extract 3 PP2-4 Juice one needs to take

- 01 ILONA: Smacznego
Tasty-GEN
Enjoy your meal
- 02 JACEK: Smacznego (. . .)
Tasty-GEN (. . .)
Enjoy your meal (. . .)
- 03 (1.2) ((Ilona touches gravy jug and napkin holder, then
raises left arm))
- 04-> ILONA: y ↑wiesz co =kom[potu_i (.)
Y know-2S what juice-GEN
Eh you know what, juice
- 05 [((reaches right arm across the table
for a jug))
- 06-> ILONA: trzeba
trzeba
one needs to
- 07 JACEK: Już. [↑Ja naleję.]
Already. I PFV-pour-1S
I'm doing it. I'll pour it.
- 08 [((Ilona lifts the jug of juice))
- 09-> ILONA: [↑wziąć_i] dob[rze_i ((puts down the jug))
take.PFV good
to take. Good.
- 10 [((Ilona puts the jug down))
- 11 JACEK: [ty nalejesz_i Ja
you PFV-pour-2S_i I
You'll pour it? I'll
- 12 na[leję.
PFV-pour-1S
pour it
- 13 ILONA: [to weź już to nalej
Then take-IMP already then PFV-pour-IMP
Then go ahead already, pour then.
- 14 (.) ((Jacek takes the jug))
- 15 JACEK: [będzie mi wygodniej
Be.FUT-3S I.DAT convenient-CMPR
It will be more convenient for me.
- 16 [((Jacek picks up the jug))
(Jacek pours juice into everyone's glasses))

As in the previous case, the claimed necessity of pouring juice can be understood in the context of an ongoing activity, namely, sitting down to have a meal, if that meal is to involve drinking something. Also, at the time at which Ilona starts producing the *trzeba-x* TCU, no such activity is as yet in hand. The extract is unusual within our corpus in that Ilona starts carrying out the named action while she is still in the course of producing her *trzeba-x* TCU. In line 4, Ilona first produces a TCU that displays that something is the matter and that her turn is addressed to a specific recipient (y ↑ *wiesz co*, [“Eh you know what”]), and then moves promptly into a *trzeba-x* TCU that will eventually be completed as *kompotu trzeba wziąć* (“Juice one needs to take,” lines 4–9). What follows from this point is a relatively complex choreography through which Ilona and Jacek eventually get the juice into the glasses. Ilona produces the first item of her new TCU, *kompotu* (“juice.GEN,” “some juice”), with a word-final rising intonation, which, together with her manipulation of the gravy jug and the napkin holder a moment earlier, might indicate that she has been going through a list, or rather, array, of mealtime-relevant items. About halfway through the production of the word *kompotu*, she begins to reach across the table toward the jug. In order to reach the jug, she moves one step along the table toward Jacek, thereby blocking his access to the table. As Ilona reaches across the table, she produces the second word of her TCU, *trzeba* (“one needs to,” line 6). Just when her hand reaches the jug, Jacek begins a turn of his own with what in Polish works as a single-word TCU: *już* (“already,” line 7).

Here we again have a responsive turn that is primarily concerned not with accepting or rejecting the necessity of the proposed action, nor that the speaker of the responsive turn carry it out, but with the fact that this action has not yet been carried out. The TCU *już* (“already”) displays an orientation toward getting the action (juice-pouring) completed. It is in the face of the circumstance that Ilona is picking up the jug (line 8) despite Jacek’s completion of *już* (“already”) that Jacek self-selects for a further TCU that is explicitly concerned with who will carry out the juice-pouring: *Ja naleję* (“I’ll pour it,” line 7). The use of the pronoun, which is optional in Polish, contributes to making his turn work as suggesting a course of action that contrasts with what is currently underway (Borek, 2009).

As the extracts considered so far illustrate, recipients can treat *trzeba-x* turns as occasions to actively involve themselves in the accomplishment of some activity that is pointed to as an objective necessity. Such acceptance of something as an objective necessity can be achieved by treating the action as urgent. Extract 4 constitutes a useful boundary case for testing these generalizations, as it departs from the type of sequential context (and ultimately from the type of outcome) of the *trzeba-x* turns considered so far. First, in this extract, the action referred to is not integral to an already ongoing activity, and second, the speaker of the *trzeba-x* turn ends up doing the named action himself. Małgorzata and two toddlers are playing with stacking shapes, while next to them, Tadeusz is swinging a baby in a little swing. Małgorzata is talking to the two toddlers. Tadeusz’s *trzeba-x* turn in line 5—“one needs to call mum”—does not receive an immediate uptake, as the only person who could provide it—Małgorzata—is engaged with Rysiek in the activity of stacking building blocks into one another. At the moment when Tadeusz produces the *trzeba-x* turn, the game of stacking the shapes has just been completed, and Małgorzata is assessing the outcome (*ale fajna jest, ale fajna jest* [“how beautiful, how beautiful”], line 6) and initiating a new game (*teraz wieżę zrobimy*, [“now we will make a tower”], line 8). After completion of this TCU, she promptly begins a new TCU, which is responsive to Tadeusz’s *trzeba-x* turn: *Tam jest telefon na tym na lodówce* [“There is the phone on this, on the fridge”], (lines 10–11).

Extract 4 PP1-2 One needs to call mum

((Małgorzata (mother) is playing with the children, Tadeusz (father) is swinging highchair))

01 (1.0)

02 Ma: No:ʔ To:ʔ Proszę. ((handing shapes to child))
PRT This Beg-1S.
So? This? Here you are.

03 (0.8)

04 Ma: Tak ta:k₆
yes so₆
yes like this₆

05->Ta: trzeba do mamy zadzwonić.=
trzeba to mum-GEN PFV-call-INF.
One needs to call mum

06 Ma: =no ↑widzisz, a:le fa::jna jest. a:le fajna jest,
PRT see-2S but fine- be.3 but fine- be.3S
There you see? How beautiful, how beautiful

07 Ry: ko::
ko::

08 Ma: no:ʔ [ter- teraz wieżę zrobimy
PRT now tower-ACC PFV.make-1P
Yes, now we will make a tower

09 Ta: [A NIE. NIE ROBisz- gr₆ęś₆ na tym [to się-
a no not make-2S play-PST-M-2S on this-LOC then REFL
Oh no, you don't do- you played on this

10 Ma: [tam jest*,
There be.3S
There is
((extended arm pointing gesture))*

11 (.) telefon na tym na lodówce, (° °).
phone on this-LOC on fridge-LOC
the phone on this on the fridge.

12 ((Ta leaves the room))

Note that, even though “calling mum” is clearly not an integral part of any ongoing activity, Małgorzata’s response is concerned primarily with making the action happen, not with accepting its necessity. She builds her turn with a distal deictic place locator (*tam* [“there”]) in turn-initial position, orienting primarily to the location of the phone. In other words, Małgorzata orients to a contingency that might prevent the phone call being made: the availability of a phone. This case illustrates that in general, activities named in a *trzeba-x* turn are normatively treated as necessary *now* whenever it is possible to accomplish that activity *now*.

The other observation of particular interest in our context is that it is Tadeusz who ends up going to the phone. We might speculate that it is Tadeusz’s mum who is about to be called, and that it would only ever be him making such a call. In any case, Tadeusz is in a better position

to make that call *now*: while Małgorzata is busy playing with the toddlers—and displaying that busyness in the delay after which she produces her responsive turn—Tadeusz is idly swinging the already content baby in her swinging chair. We can then note that *trzeba-x* turns are treated by recipients as occasions to get involved in accomplishing an action, even when this involvement will not consist in carrying out the relevant action. The impersonality and the strong normative claim of the *trzeba-x* construction make it possible for an interlocutor to enact a shared responsibility for bringing an action underway, even when it will be the other person ultimately carrying out that action.

If *trzeba-x* turns were correctly characterized as addressing a directive or a request to another person, we might wonder why Małgorzata in the previous case did not produce a rejection on the grounds that she is busy playing with the toddlers. In fact, such more or less unsuccessful episodes, in which the recipient of the *trzeba-x* turn does not carry out the relevant action, provide compelling evidence that we are not dealing with requests or directives here. Blocking responses to *trzeba-x* turns in our collection never draw on a recipient's unwillingness or inability. Instead, they provide claims about the requirements of the situation that differ from the claim embodied in the *trzeba-x* turn. Extract 5 provides one such case.

In this extract, Ilona attempts unsuccessfully to launch a new topic of conversation: *Ciekawe co Aśka dzisiaj na obiad jadła* ("I wonder what Aśka had for lunch today"). As we know from a part of the interaction that occurred some 25 min earlier, Aśka is spending the day with a dancing group outside of the city. Jacek had announced to his son Bolek that "we" will be calling the group leader after lunch to find out whether they have returned to the city yet (*Po obiedzie zadzwonimy do Pani* ["After lunch we will call the lady"]). After Ilona's attempt at launching Aśka's lunch as a topic, a silence of several seconds unfolds. During this silence, Jacek looks at his watch, and then Ilona also looks at Jacek's watch, after which she offers the observation that it is "already" 3 o'clock (*O już piętnasta* ["Aha, already 3 o'clock"], line 4). This observation receives minimal vocal confirmation as well as head nods from Jacek (line 5), which might work to claim access to the direction in which Ilona's latest observation is going (see Stivers, 2008, on the separate but possibly related finding that recipient nodding works as a practice for claiming access to a teller's stance during storytelling).

It is in this sequential context that Ilona produces a *trzeba-x* turn: *to trzeba będzie faktycznie zadzwonić do Pani* ("then one will really need to call the lady"). Note that even though Ilona's turn is future-marked ("one *will* need to call"), Jacek's blocking response deals with the *trzeba-x* turn as making the phone call relevant *now*: *Myślę że o wpół wystarczy bo oni najpierw na Grodzką jadą* ("I think at half past will be enough because they go to Grodzka Street first") lines 9–13. This blocking response has the characteristic turn shape of a dispreferred second pair-part (Pomerantz, 1984): delay (ostensibly filled with chewing, line 8), mitigation (*myślę* ["I think"]), and an account (*bo oni najpierw na Grodzką jadą* ["because they are going to Grodzka Street first"]). The most important point in our context is *how* Jacek accounts for his block: Not by pointing out his inability ("I don't have the number") or his unwillingness ("Let me finish my food first") but by claiming that the requirements of the situation are different from what Ilona thinks they are. This is a feature of blocking responses to *trzeba-x* turns throughout our collection: Blocking responses to *trzeba-x* turns, on the rare occasions when they occur, are occupied with managing participants' knowledge of, and evidence for, the objective requirements of the situation.

- 01 ILONA: ho_o ciekawe co Aśka dzisiaj na obiad
 ho_o interesting what Aśka today on lunch
Ho_o I wonder what Aśka had for lunch
- 02 jadła. °bhh°
 ate °bhh°
today
- 03 (5.0) ((*Ilona drinks, Jacek checks watch, Ilona glances at Jacek's watch*))
- 04 ILONA: O już piętnasta
 PRT already fifteen
Aha it's 3 already
- 05 JACEK: Mhm_o ((*head nods*))
- 06 ILONA: m:, to trzeba będzie faktycznie zadzwonić
 m: then trzeba will factually call
m: then one will really need to call
- 07 do pani
 to lady-GEN
the lady
- 08 (1.0 ((*Jacek chewing*)))
- 09->JACEK: Myślę że o wpół wystarczy
 think-1S that at half suffice
I think at half will be enough
- 10 bo [oni najpierw] (.) hm (1.0)* na Grodzką
 because they first hm on Grodzka
because they first go to Grodzka Street
- 11 ((*Jacek swallowing*))*
- 12 ILONA: [↑mhm]
- 13 *jadą.
 drive
Street
- 14 *((*gaze to Ilona*))
- 15 (.)
- 16 ILONA: Aha. ((*head nods*)) ale tam: (.) [to jest
 Aha but there that is
 Aha but there that is]
- 17 JACEK: [Tam jest
 there is
 there is]

- 18 starsza grupa chyba.
 old-CMPR group probably
 the older group I think
- 19 ILONA: A rozumiem
 Ah understand-1S
 Ah I see
- 20 (.)

In sum, *trzeba-x* turns realize an action that we might gloss as pointing to an evident necessity. They are systematically chosen by speakers in family interaction to enlist another person for the accomplishment of some action in situations in which the proposed action is integral to the progress of some ongoing activity; such action has not been initiated so far; it can best be carried out by a single person; and a person other than the speaker is (or can be claimed to be) in a good position to carry out that action. Embodied and verbal conduct in aligning responses to *trzeba-x* turns in such situations are oriented to the temporal dimension of the realization of the proposed action, not to its acceptance. Blocking responses draw on divergent assessments of the objective requirements of the situation, not on inability or unwillingness.

Constructions With Deontic Modality in English Interaction

We have shown that *trzeba-x* turns are part of an organization that provides an occasion to enact shared responsibility. We have said that this is achieved in part because *trzeba x* makes the named activity an *objective* necessity, that is, a necessity present in the situation rather than one felt by a particular subject. For comparative purposes, we now want to consider some related formulations of declarative turns in English interaction. First, we might wonder whether declaratives that are subjective (i.e., that have a grammatical subject), but formulated in the plural, such as “we need to do *x*,” might not be used for the same actions. Our data suggest that they are not. *We need to do x* turns, on the rare occasions when they are used in the context of accomplishing some embodied activity *now*, are produced by speakers who are in the process of initiating an action that has to be, or should be, carried out collectively by more than one person (Extract 6).

Extract 6 BB6-2 We need to put on your bib

((*Monica, Eric and 2-year-old daughter Chioma are about to sit down for dinner. Eric is also holding baby Tonia in one arm. Chioma is starting to tackle her food with cutlery*))

- 01 Er: W(h)o(h)o(h)ow.
 02 (.)
 03-> Er: But before* you do that_i (.) we need to put on your bib.
 04 * ((*Eric moves to take bib*))
 05 (1.6) ((*Eric tries to put bib on Chioma with one hand*))
 06-> Er: [Caw-]Can we have the bib please
 07 Mo: [Can you take that]
 08 ((*Chioma turns toward Eric. Eric and Monica put Chioma's bib on*))

The activity of putting on a bib that Eric is initiating here will involve coordinated embodied actions by himself and another person, Chioma. That is, the person-marked *we need to x* turn here (and in other cases we have seen, both in English and in Polish), works to enlist another person

for an activity that will nevertheless *also* be carried out by the speaker (see also Goodwin's discussion of "we gotta x"-turns: M. H. Goodwin, 1990, p. 112). Obviously, a turn formatted with plural marking, such as a "we"-marked declarative, would seem particularly apt for such situations. The personal pronoun "we" (as well as the relevant verb marking in Polish) refers to a collectivity that can be enumerated, and enumeration is indeed an alternative choice that speakers of English sometimes make in collective self-reference (Lerner & Kitzinger, 2007). *We need to do x* declaratives are similar to *Let's x* directives as discussed by Goodwin (M. H. Goodwin, 1990) in that both formats are used when two or more people are going to do something together. Formulating an action as something that "one" has to do, on the other hand, imbues the claim with strong normativity. Such actions are proposed as necessities not for any particular (enumerable) individuals, not for *the two of us*, but as necessities for *anyone in our situation*, for example, any couple or family.

Although we do not have any instances of *let's x*-formatted turns in our English corpus, we might briefly discuss the differences between such turns and *trzeba-x* turns. One difference is that *trzeba-x* turns are used, as we have seen, to initiate dealing with a situation that requires action from *one* person. But the *Let's x* construction differs from *trzeba x* also in other respects. According to Goodwin, *let's x* "signals a proposal rather than either a command or a request" (M. H. Goodwin, 1990, p. 111). While glosses such as "proposal," "command," or "request" can receive various definitions neither the formatting of *trzeba-x* turns, embodying as they do a strong normative claim, nor their uptake, suggest that these are treated as mere "proposals" by participants to interaction. Third, and finally, *let's x* turns are produced "as suggestions for action in the future," not as "a command that an action should be undertaken immediately" (M. H. Goodwin, 1990, p. 110). As we have seen, *trzeba-x* turns address a necessity that has emerged in the unfolding of a broader activity, and displaying urgency is a common feature of aligning responses to *trzeba-x* turns.

Since all English verbs require person marking, a construction such as *trzeba x* does not exist in English. However, one way of building a loosely speaking impersonal construction in English is to use an object as a grammatical subject: *the bin needs taking out*, *the cat needs to get her food*, etc. We might wonder whether such constructions are used for the same kind of action as the *trzeba-x* construction.

Again, it seems that they are not. In our data, constructions of the type *the x needs y-ing* or *the x needs to y* are used exclusively in situations with the following characteristics: First, the coparticipants' joint attention is already on the *x* in question, and second, the recipient of the *x needs y-ing* turn is already in the course of doing something with the *x*—in other words, the *x needs y-ing* TCU provides some sort of advice on how to proceed with that object. The following case illustrates these general characteristics (Extract 7).

Extract 7 BB2-2 That teacup needs to come in here

((Daughter Amy is walking into the kitchen holding an apparently very dirty teacup with an outstretched arm. She stops next to her mum, Ellen, who is washing dishes in the sink))

01 Am: eh hehehe ew*::: hehehe ((walks behind Ellens's back))

02 *((Ellen looks at cup))

03-> El: well that nec- that teacup* needs to come in ↑here

04 *((Amy places cup on work area))

05 (1.6)

06 Am: I can't get it out; you can use that dirty spoon;

Some minutes prior to this extract, Ellen, who is washing dishes in the kitchen sink, had asked her daughter, Amy, to go through the house and “check for washing up.” At the beginning of this extract, Amy comes into the kitchen with what seems to be a particularly spectacular find – a teacup with some contents that she “can’t get out” (line 6). She walks into the kitchen with her outstretched arm holding the teacup, and, laughing in a mock-disgusted manner about her find she stops next to her mum. After Ellen has looked into the cup and given an appreciative smile, Amy continues to walk into the kitchen, behind Ellen’s back. It is at this point that Ellen says that “that teacup needs to come in here” (line 3), that is, into the sink. In sum, it seems that the deontic construction *x needs to y* is used in environments where the turn is responsive to an already present occupation with the named object.

Some Differences Between Requests and *Trzeba-x* Turns

Another strategy for assessing how far the kind of action embodied by *trzeba-x* turns is specifically afforded by its grammatical format is to examine actions that are common in similar situations in English-mediated interactions. Recall that in the kind of situation we are dealing with, the speaker attempts to enlist another person for carrying out an action that is integral to the progression of a broader activity; no such action has been initiated; the action in question is best carried out by a single person; and the recipient is in a good position to carry out that action.

When situations of that kind arise in our English corpus of family interactions, speakers predominantly produce a request in the form *Can you do x?* Extract 8 provides one such case:

Extract 8 BB1-1 Can you get a bib on him for me

((Cheryl, Joe, and baby Tim are about to have breakfast. Baby Tim is sitting in a highchair, Joe is playing with him.))

01-> CHE: oop(.) must get you a ↑bib, =>can you get a ↑bib

02 on ‘im for me< plea:se babes

03 (0.4)

04 JOE: sure ((takes bib from Cheryl))

05 CHE: °mh°

06 (1.0)

07 CHE: thank you

((Joe puts bib on Tim))

In this extract, Cheryl and Joe are preparing to have breakfast with their nearly 1-yr-old son, Tim. Cheryl notices that something is the matter (displayed by her “oop” in line 1), and names that matter in a new TCU: Tim needs to be fitted with a bib before breakfast can commence. Note that her TCU (“must get you a bib”) is a declarative with deontic modality without person marking (Oh, 2005). This means that formally, again, we have here a construction that is similar to *trzeba-x* turns. However, this TCU is not treated as having the efficacy to enlist Joe for the bib-fitting – neither by Cheryl herself, who immediately launches into a further TCU, nor by Joe, who disengages from his playing with Tim and attends to Cheryl only at the start of “plea:se babes” (line 2), that is, after possible completion of an entire additional TCU. This additional, third TCU by Cheryl is a request in entitled format (Curl & Drew, 2008): “>can you get a ↑bib on ‘im for me< plea:se babes<” (lines 1–2).

According to Curl and Drew (2008), speakers choose the request format *can/could you do x* when they do not expect there to be any obstacles that would restrict the recipient's ability to grant the request. Curl and Drew therefore call this the "entitled" format for requests. As we should expect, in our corpus of English family recordings, requests are most often produced in entitled format in order to enlist coparticipants for some activity. Nevertheless, since such requests (*can/could you do x*) have the grammatical format of an interrogative, they produce a slot in which the recipient's confirmation of his or her ability and willingness becomes relevant. Acting in an aligning manner in response to such a request means to negate the potential lack of ability or willingness—as Joe does with his verbal response in line 4 ("sure"). His turn shares characteristics of a type-conforming response to a *yes/no* interrogative (Raymond, 2003): It provides a *yes*-type response in turn-initial position, without any further expansion. Joe thereby treats Cheryl's attempt to enlist him for putting a bib on his son as a matter for which his acceptance to do the job is a relevant action. In sum, throughout a request exchange, participants mutually orient toward the appropriateness of enlisting another person for a course of action.

Trzeba-x turns, as we have seen, are not addressed from *me* to *you* in the same way as requests; they are voiced in the name of an unnamed collectivity—the family or the parent couple in our cases. In aligning responses, there is no matter of agreeing or accepting; instead, such responses are oriented toward the soonest-possible accomplishment of the action. In sum, throughout a *trzeba-x* exchange, participants mutually orient toward evident requirements of the situation.

In our Polish corpus, requests in the form of a *can/could you do x?* turn are exceedingly rare (there are only two cases in a collection of 160). More importantly, they occur in sequential environments that are in some sense delicate. In Extract 9, Piotr (the father) and Ala (the mother) are having soup with their sons, Lesio and Patryk, and their baby is sitting on Ala's lap. Piotr has gone to the kitchen area, out of the view of the camera, and has apparently started inspecting the food for the dinner on the stovetop.

Extract 9 PP5-1 One needs to add tomato paste

- 01 PIOTR: To już jest dobre do jedzenia ta:k? o to?
This already be-3S good to eating-GEN yes? PRT this?
This is ready for eating yes? This here?
- 02 ALA: No chyba ↑ta:k.
so probably yes
Well I guess yes
- 03 (.)
- 04-> ALA Ale >wiesz co nie nie<=jesz- jeszcze trzeba do[dać (.)
But know-2S what no no still trzeba PFV-add-INF
But you know what no, no, one still has to add
- 05 LESIO: [HEHE
- 06 ALA: LESZEK
- 07 (0.6)
- 08-> ALA: Jeszcze trzeba dodać [e:: koncentrat pomidorowy
Still trzeba PFV-add-INF eh concentrate tomato-ADJ
One still has to add eh tomato paste

- 09 PATRYK: [poprosze:ɫ
PFV-beg-1S
What is it?
- 10 (0.4) ((Ala looking toward Piotr))
- 11 PIOTR: Naczy nie jest gotowe do je[dzenia.
mean-3S not be-3S ready-N to eating-GEN
That means it is not ready for eating.
- 12 ALA: [no nie jest.
PRT not be-3S
No it isn't
- 13 (1.6) ((Ala looking toward Piotr))
- 14-> ALA: A ↑mógłbyś otworzyć koncentrat?
And can-COND-2S open-INF concentrate?
But could you open the paste?
- 15 (0.4)
- 16 PIOTR: Gdzie jest
where be-3S
Where is it

To Piotr's question whether "this" is ready (line 1), Ala initially responds with a tentative confirmation (*no chyba ta:k* ["well I guess yes"], line 2), but then corrects herself and, in line 4, provides a different response. This new response is complex. She starts with *ale wiesz co* ("but you know what"), linking her new response with a turn-initial disjunctive *ale* ("but") to her initial response, and indicating that some matter will be addressed to Piotr. Her next TCU (*nie nie* ["no no"]) can be heard as a way of specifying what the matter is: The initial response that the food is "probably ready" was wrong, and the correct response instead is that it is not ready. Multiple sayings such as Ala's *nie nie* commonly perform a specifiable action other than what the item produced singly (*nie*) would be doing. They are responsive not just to the immediately prior turn, but address an ongoing activity as a whole as problematic and display that this activity should be halted (Stivers, 2004). In the present case, Ala's initial response that the food is "probably" ready would serve to further an activity initiated by Piotr's question, namely moving to the next course of the meal. With her *nie nie*, Ala displays not just that her initial response was wrong, but that any such activity should be suspended.

In this sequential context Ala produces the beginning of a *trzeba-x* TCU next (*jeszcze trzeba dodać* ["still one needs to add"], line 4). She interrupts this TCU to admonish one of her sons, and finally, recycling the turn beginning, produces the full TCU: *jeszcze trzeba dodać e:: koncentrat pomidorowy* ("still one needs to add tomato paste"), line 8.

Let us note first that we are in normal territory for *trzeba-x* turns. The action referred to—putting tomato paste into the food—is an integral part of furthering the already ongoing activity—having dinner. However, no such action has as yet started, and the absence of such an action has been oriented to as problematic for the wider activity of eating the meal in Ala's multiple *nie nie*. Furthermore, it is an action that is best carried out by one person alone, and Piotr is in a good position to do it. Ala's *trzeba-x* turn here clearly provides an occasion for Piotr to involve himself in getting the tomato paste into the food. Furthermore, Ala's gaze provides for a recipient of her *trzeba-x* turn: Upon completion of the TCU, Ala keeps her face oriented toward Piotr, a practice

that is employed by first speakers to pursue an absent responsive action (Rossano, Brown, & Levinson, 2009).

In other words, Ala's body orientation displays that the interaction is not over at this point. However, as becomes evident, Piotr does not take the opportunity to perform a responsive action of involving himself in the tomato paste problem. Instead, he produces a new first pair-part ostensibly designed to check whether he correctly understood that the food is not ready, thereby treating the whole of Ala's previous turn as just a long-winded response to his original question—a possibility afforded by the declarative format of the *trzeba-x* turn (*Naczy nie jest gotowe do jedzenia* ["So it is not ready for eating"], line 11). Ala's affiliative response to this question comes promptly (*no nie jest* ["no it's not"], line 12). The completion of this adjacency pair provides another point in time at which Piotr's responsive action to Ala's *trzeba-x* TCU becomes relevant. Again, Ala keeps her face oriented toward Piotr during the substantial silence that now unfolds (line 13). She thereby again treats the silence not as simply nothing happening, but as a gap, a noticeable absence of relevant activity. Finally, she chooses to ask Piotr to "open" the tomato paste, linking this request to the prior talk with a turn initial *a* ("and/but"): *a mógłbyś otworzyć koncentrat?* ("but could you open the paste?"). Piotr's response (*Gdzie jest* ["where is"], line 16) constitutes a move toward granting that request, although without any overt acceptance.

Multiple attempts at enlisting another person for the accomplishment of some activity can sometimes be analyzed as upgrades or downgrades of one another. For example, Craven and Potter (2010) describe sequences in which mothers produce multiple directives that become more insistent and less mitigated in the face of a child's noncompliance. Curl and Drew (2008) describe sequences in which speakers produce multiple requests with increasing orientation to possible contingencies associated with granting the request.

In contrast to those data, we are not convinced that it is felicitous to analyze Ala's production of a request in the absence of a response to her earlier *trzeba-x* turn as either an upgrade or a downgrade. Such gradations of force can be discussed in terms of the relative directness of different formats for enlisting another person for accomplishing some activity, but it seems difficult to compare Ala's *could you* request and her *trzeba-x* turn on a common scale of directness. For example, we could consider a *trzeba-x* turn less direct than a *could you*-request because it does not formally address another person. The declarative format of a *trzeba-x* turn mobilizes response to a lesser degree than does an interrogatively formatted turn such as *Can you do x* (Stivers & Rossano, 2010), particularly in the present environment within Ala's turn, where it can be taken as an account of her halting the activity projected by Piotr's question. The active involvement that we have shown to be characteristic of aligning responses is made possible precisely by the relatively low response mobilization carried by a *trzeba-x* turn. On the other hand, we could consider *trzeba-x* turns more direct than *could you* requests in view of the strong normative claim they make and the fact that, as we have shown, *trzeba-x* turns are not oriented to potential lack of the other person's ability or willingness to carry out the relevant action.

Finally, we might consider the relation of *trzeba-x* turns to the notion of *pre*-requests (Lerner, 1996; Levinson, 1983, chapter 6; Schegloff, 2007, chapter 5). In so far as *trzeba-x* turns do not directly *ask* or *tell* another person to do something, we might consider them as a device for fishing for an offer (Pomerantz, 1980). However, in contrast to the cases analyzed as *pre*-requests in the literature, *trzeba-x* turns in our collection never receive offers as first responsive actions. Furthermore, if *pre*-requests are interpreted as a practice for being indirect, i.e., for avoiding a

base action of enlisting another person for some activity (Levinson, 1983), a habitual grammatical practice such as the *trzeba-x* format might not be well suited for such a purpose (just as it would be impossible to build the action of a *pre*-request with the conventionally indirect *can you do x* format). Finally, if *trzeba x* was a *pre*-request, we would expect to find this format only as a first attempt at enlisting another person, but not as a subsequent attempt, after a first attempt has failed. However, we do have an instance in our collection where an unsuccessful imperative-formatted attempt to get a child to drink her tea is followed by a *trzeba-x* turn, after which the child begins to comply (this case is available as additional data on the web site).

In sum, it seems most appropriate to say that in Extract 9, we are dealing with a move from one to another, interactionally quite different, type of action. While Ala's *trzeba-x* turn is oriented to situational requirements, and treats Piotr as one of the people who have a responsibility for addressing that necessity, her *could you x* turn is oriented to potential, and in this instance clearly very real, interpersonal delicacies in enlisting Piotr for the accomplishment of that activity.

Extract 10 further underlines the character of requests as a second choice in Polish family interactions and further illustrates the differences between requests and *trzeba-x* turns. This extract comes from the same family dinner as the previous one.

Extract 10 PP5-1 Would you cut some bread?

- 01 PIOTR: Jest coś inne- jest coś na drugie czy nie ma?
be-3S what-NDET oth- be-3S what-NDET on second-N or not have.3S?
Is there someth- is there something for a second course or not?
- 02 ALA: No jest zu- y: jest y::m ka[pusta
PRT be-3S sou- y be-3S y m cabbage
well yes there is sou- eh there is eh hm cabbage
- 03 LESIO: [Kotlet się bierze tak i
Chops REFL take.3S so and
Chops you take like this and
- 04 [tak AM
so am
this hum
- 05 ALA: [>Tylko trzeba chleb-< y dokroiłbyś chleba?
Only trzeba bread- y PFV-cut-COND-2S bread-GEN?
Only one needs to bread- would you cut some additional bread?
- 06 ((Piotr drops his head and looks away, then gets up))
- 07 (1.0)

Having finished his soup, Piotr enquires about the availability of a second course. After Ala has confirmed that there will be a second course, she self-selects, in line 5, to announce that, however, “one needs to” do something with bread—presumably, cut some. In this situation, a completed TCU “one needs to cut some more bread” would produce a situation in which Piotr would be expected to undertake the bread-cutting—not because he had been asked (he hasn't), but because he is in the better position to discharge this shared responsibility. However, aligning with the project brought under way in this manner would require Piotr to include himself in the

abstract collectivity (“one”) whose responsibility it is to provide for sliced bread. As it happens, Ala suspends the ongoing course of action and abandons this TCU, replacing it with a different action: a request that addresses Piotr and changes Ala’s interactional identity from her *as one member of the collectivity of a parental couple* to her *as an individual*: *dokroiłbyś chleba?* (“would you cut some additional bread?”), line 5). Piotr complies with this request, but it is evident from the shape of his compliant response that Ala was right not to take Piotr’s willingness to get involved for granted: rather than producing any type-conforming vocal response (Raymond, 2003), he drops his head and then gets up and goes toward the kitchen area.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present study investigated action affordances of an impersonal declarative construction of deontic modality in Polish—*trzeba x* (“one needs to *x*”)—in situations in which a speaker enlists another person for the accomplishment of some practical activity. We found that *trzeba-x* turns in first position are regularly chosen by speakers to point to a possible action as an evident necessity for the furthering of some broader ongoing activity. Such turns in first position provide an environment in which recipients can enact shared responsibility by actively involving themselves in the relevant action. Aligning responses to *trzeba-x* turns never provide tokens of agreement (“yes”) or acceptance (“okay”). Instead, they prioritize the immediacy with which the relevant action will be carried out (e.g., with turn-initial temporal adverbs such as *zaraz* [“right now”]). Blocking responses to *trzeba-x* turns claim that the requirements of the situation are different from those claimed by the first speaker.

Conversation analysts and interactional linguists have shown how a wide variety of conversational actions are constituted by means of the grammatical details of turn design (e.g., Hakulinen & Selting, 2005; Ochs et al., 1996; Selting & Couper-Kuhlen, 2001; Sidnell, 2009c). The present article contributes to this body of work by suggesting a mutual relationship between grammatical turn design and the organization of cooperation in the area of practical household activities. Previous work on enlisting another person for the accomplishment of some activity, in particular in the areas of cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics, has considered categories such as *request* or *directive* as solid starting points for cross-linguistic comparison. That work has found that actions of requesting or directing are inflected in culture-specific ways, for example, in relation to cultural politeness norms (e.g., Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Ogiermann, 2009). In contrast, the present study has shown that pointing to a necessity with a *trzeba-x* turn and asking another person to do something with a *can you* request are not differently polite versions of the same action, but rather different actions. Whereas modal request sequences are oriented to the recipient’s ability and willingness to carry out the action, *trzeba-x* sequences are oriented to participants’ knowledge of the requirements of the situation, while building on the presumption of shared responsibility for the activity that is under way.

The present study raises some questions about the social and cognitive skills that members of different cultures need to bring to participation in cooperative activities. Requests in modal interrogative format (*Can you do x?*), which are the unmarked format in which speakers in English interaction attempt to enlist another for the accomplishment of some practical activity in the kind of situational environment described in this study, embody an orientation to the recipient’s ability or willingness to carry out that action. The results of the present study, on the other hand, suggest

that in *trzeba-x* sequences, the other person's ability or willingness are not systematically relevant for participants. In choosing a *trzeba-x* format, first speakers build on the presumption that a given necessity will be treated as a joint responsibility. In sum, *trzeba-x* turns are a practice for the organization of cooperation that is substantially different from requests: While requests are oriented to an *interpersonal* dimension of the situation, pointing to a necessity with a *trzeba-x* turn is oriented to *evidential grounds* available in the situational context. Further research will have to show how widely (or narrowly) practices for the organization of practical cooperative activities range across languages. For the time being, we can note that, although in the global scheme of things, English and Polish communities of speakers are linguistically, culturally, and geographically not very distant from one another, we can identify substantial differences in the form that cooperation takes in a mundane, common type of situation.

The present study has been explicitly "comparativist" (Schegloff, 2009, p. 375) in design, that is, we have gone beyond describing a practice in Polish and discussing it in the context of what is known about English interaction and have instead specified what is distinctive about the Polish practice by analyzing both Polish and English data. It seems to us not only that it is possible to do comparative work from a conversation-analytic perspective; rather, we feel that explicit comparison, involving the specification of bases for comparison in grammar and in the multimodal configuration of situations, can be a powerful tool for conversation analysts. It is only through detailed comparison that the full interactional implications of sometimes subtle cross-linguistic differences become appreciable. While such difference is, in the present study, a matter of interest for the analysts, not for the participants, we have tried to show that it is possible to pursue such an interest through an analysis that is rigorously based on participants' own orientations in interaction.

We have shown that a grammatical construction can afford speakers of the language a type of social action for the organization of practical activity that is not available to speakers of a language that lacks this grammatical structure. It seems to us that comparative conversation-analytic research can open a novel avenue for researchers interested in the relationship between language diversity and the cultural diversity of human lives (see also Sidnell & Enfield in press), an avenue that has the potential to help us get beyond an entrenched dichotomy in the study of the social-cognitive implications of language diversity. Much current research is concerned either with the study of diversity in individual cognition (as in work on linguistic relativism) or with the study of diversity in the lubrication of social encounters (as in work on politeness, see Ogiermann, 2009). This dichotomy is part of a theme that runs deep in the social and behavioral sciences, namely the notion that observable social behavior is a superficial phenomenon that expresses an underlying core, the serious business of an individual's perception and cognition. But the results of the present study do not sit easily in either of these categories. They point to the situated and ongoing process of socialization into the specific skills and sensitivities that make us participants rather than mere observers in our social lives.

REFERENCES

- Betz, E., & Golato, A. (2008). Remembering relevant information and withholding relevant next actions: The German token "achja." *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41, 58–98.
- Bickel, B., Comrie, B., & Haspelmath, M. (2008). The Leipzig glossing rules. Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses. Retrieved from <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>

- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 196–213.
- Borek, A. (2009, September). Is “ja” necessarily redundant? *The use of free-standing first person pronoun in Polish*. Paper presented at the Conference on Everyday Interaction across Cultures, Portsmouth (UK).
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Ford, C. E. (2004). *Sound patterns in interaction. Cross-linguistic studies from conversation*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Craven, A., & Potter, J. (2010). Directives: Entitlement and contingency in action. *Discourse Studies*, 12, 419–442.
- Curl, T. S., & Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and action. A comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41, 129–153.
- Egbert, M., & Vöge, M. (2008). Wh-interrogative formats used for questioning and beyond: German *warum* (why) and *wieso* (why) and English *why*. *Discourse Studies*, 10, 17–36.
- Enfield N. J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2007). *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Enfield N. J., Stivers, T., & Levinson, S. C. (2010). Question-response sequences in conversation across ten languages: An introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2615–2619.
- Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M., & Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 185–237). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, C. (2002). Time in action. *Current Anthropology*, 43, S19–S35.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said. Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, M. H. (2006). Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response sequences. *Text & Talk*, 26, 513–541.
- Hakulinen, A., & Selting, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Syntax and lexis in conversation: Studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in-interaction*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands & Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Hansen, B. (2000). The German modal verb *müssen* and the Slavonic languages—The reconstruction of a success story. *Scando-Slavica*, 46, 77–92.
- Hayashi, M. (2003). *Joint utterance construction in Japanese conversation*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Hockett, C. F. (1954). Chinese versus English: An exploration of the Whorfian theses. In H. Hoijer (Ed.), *Language in culture. Conference on the interrelations of language and other aspects of culture* (pp. 106–123). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Keevallik, L. (2010). Marking boundaries between activities: The particle *nii* in Estonian. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43, 157–182.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). Finding “face” in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59, 303–321.
- Lerner, G. H. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society*, 32, 177–201.
- Lerner, G. H., & Kitzinger, C. (2007). Extraction and aggregation in the repair of individual and collective self-reference. *Discourse Studies*, 9, 526–557.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lindström, A. (2005). Language as social action: A study of how senior citizens request assistance with practical tasks in the Swedish home help service. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation* (pp. 209–233). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.
- Lindström, A. (2009). Projecting nonalignment in conversation. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 135–158). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Nuyts, J., Byloo, P., & Diepeveen, J. (2010). On deontic modality, directivity, and mood: The case of Dutch *mogen* and *moeten*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 16–34.
- Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., & Thompson, S. A. (Eds.). (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogiermann, E. (2009). Politeness and in-directness across cultures: A comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian requests. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 5, 189–216.

- Oh, S.-Y. (2005). English zero anaphora as an interactional resource. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38, 267–302.
- Oh, S.-Y. (2007). Overt reference to speaker and recipient in Korean. *Discourse Studies*, 9, 462–492.
- Park, Y. (2009). Interaction between grammar and multimodal resources: Quoting different characters in Korean multiparty conversation. *Discourse Studies*, 11, 79–104.
- Pomerantz, A. (1980). Telling my side: “limited access” as a fishin’ device. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, 186–198.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 939–967.
- Rossano, F., Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). Gaze, questioning, and culture. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 187–249). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1995). Discourse as interactional achievement III: The omnirelevance of action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28, 185–211.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52–133). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction. A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2009). One perspective on *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives*. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 357–406). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Selting, M., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (Eds.). (2001). *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Sidnell, J. (2007). Comparative studies in conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 36, 229–244.
- Sidnell, J. (2009a). Comparative perspectives in conversation analysis. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 3–27). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2009b). Language-specific resources in repair and assessments. In J. Sidnell (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 304–325). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J. (Ed.). (2009c). *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J., & Enfield N. J. (in press). Language diversity and social action: A third locus of linguistic relativity. *Current Anthropology*.
- Sorjonen, M.-L. (1996). On repeats and responses in Finnish conversations. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 277–327). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T. (2004). “No no no” and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 30, 260–293.
- Stivers, T. (2008). Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41, 31–57.
- Stivers, T., & Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43, 3–31.
- Stivers, T., & Sidnell, J. (2005). Introduction: Multi-modal interaction. *Semiotica*, 156, 1–20.
- Streeck, J. (2009). *Gesturecraft: The manufacture of meaning*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Tanaka, H. (1999). *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Tanaka, H. (2000). Turn projection in Japanese talk-in-interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33, 1–38.
- Tanaka, H. (2005). Grammar and the “timing” of social action: Word order and preference organization in Japanese. *Language in Society*, 34, 389–430.